



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/651,680	08/30/2000	Anil K. Goyal	410093.401	2023

22504 7590 09/27/2004

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP
2600 CENTURY SQUARE
1501 FOURTH AVENUE
SEATTLE, WA 98101-1688

EXAMINER

PASS, NATALIE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3626

DATE MAILED: 09/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/651,680

Applicant(s)

GOYAL, ANIL K.

Examiner

Natalie A. Pass

Art Unit

3626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

1. This communication is in response to the Request for Continued Examination and amendment filed 10 August 2004. Claims 1-4, 7, 11-12, 15-20, 24 and 27 have been amended. Claims 1-27 remain pending.

Specification

2. The amendment filed 10 August 2004 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. "New matter" constitutes any material which meets the following criteria:

a) It is added to the disclosure (either the specification, the claims, or the drawings) after the filing date of the application, and

b) It contains new information which is neither included nor implied in the original version of the disclosure. This includes the addition of physical properties, new uses, etc. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows:

- "having no business relationship with the commentary reporting service" in claim 1, on lines 5-6;
- "positive rating category" and "negative rating category" in claim 1, on lines 7-8, 14, 20, in claim 5, lines 4-5, in claim 7, line 5, and in claim 12 on line 9;
- "unrelated to the service provider" in claim 7, on lines 5; and
- "having no business relationship with the user-selected entity" in claim 20, on lines 8-9.

Art Unit: 3626

In particular, Applicant does not point to, nor was the Examiner able to find, any support for this newly added language within the specification as originally filed on 30 August 2000. As such, Applicant is respectfully requested to clarify the above issues and to specifically point out support for the newly added limitations in the originally filed specification and claims.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

3. If Applicant continues to prosecute the application, revision of the specification and claims to present the application in proper form is required. While an application can, be amended to make it clearly understandable, no subject matter can be added that was not disclosed in the application as originally filed on 30 August 2000.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

(A) Newly amended claims 1, 7, 12, and 20 recite limitations that are new matter, as discussed above, and are therefore rejected.

(B) Dependent claims 2-6, 8-11, 13-19, and 21-27 incorporate the features of claims 1, 7, 12 and 20 through dependency and are also rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-4, 7-16, 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being as being anticipated by Sloo, U.S. Patent Number 5, 895, 450.

NOTE: The following rejections assume that the subject matter added in 10 August 2004 amendment are NOT new matter, and are provided hereinbelow for Applicant's consideration, on the condition that Applicant properly traverses the new matter objections and rejections made in sections 2-3, and 5 above in the next communication sent in response to the present Office Action.

(A) Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

- ♦ "commentary reporting" on lines 3, 9-10, 16, and 19;
 - ♦ "having no business relationship with the commentary reporting service" on lines 5-6;
- and
- ♦ "voluntarily" on line 9.

Art Unit: 3626

(A) As per claim 1, Sloo teaches a method for consumer recording and publicly reporting monetary commentary, the method comprising:

electronically communicating with a complaint handling apparatus (reads on commentary reporting service) at a first time (Sloo; see at least Figure 1, Figure 3, column 1, line 53 to column 2, line 20, column 2, lines 53 to column 3, line 30) to permit a user to:

select an entity having no business relationship with the commentary reporting service (Sloo; see at least Figure 1, Figure 3, column 1, line 53 to column 2, line 20, column 2, lines 53 to column 3, line 30, column 6, lines 24-67);

select a positive rating category or a negative rating category for the user-selected entity (Sloo; column 3, lines 7-17, column 5, line 56 to column 6, line 4, column 6, lines 46-67, column 8, line 59 to column 9, line 10, column 11, line 63 to column 12, line 5, column 12, lines 15-24, column 14, line 60 to column 15, line 40, column 18, lines 16-17);

voluntarily provide a monetary contribution to the complaint handling apparatus (reads on commentary reporting service) to provide a quantifiable indication of user satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the user –selected entity thereby build the reputation of the user –selected entity up or down (Sloo; column 3, lines 7-17, column 5, line 56 to column 6, line 4, column 6, lines 46-67, column 8, line 19 to column 9, line 56, column 11, line 63 to column 12, line 5, column 12, lines 15-25, column 12, line 61 to column 13, line 57, column 14, line 60 to column 15, line 40, column 18, lines 16-17);

storing data related to the user-selected entity, a value of the monetary payment and the user decision to build the reputation up or down (Sloo; Figure 1, Figure 3, Figure 5, Item 514, column 3, lines 7-17, column 5, line 56 to column 6, line 4, column 6, lines 46-67, column 8, line

Art Unit: 3626

59 to column 9, line 10, column 11, line 63 to column 12, line 5, column 12, lines 15-25, column 12, line 61 to column 13, line 57, column 14, line 60 to column 15, line 40, column 18, lines 16-17);

electronically communicating with the complaint handling apparatus (reads on commentary reporting service) at a second time different from the first time to:

select the entity (Sloo; see at least Figure 1, Figure 3, column 1, line 53 to column 2, line 20, column 2, lines 53 to column 3, line 30, column 6, lines 24-67); and

retrieve stored data from the complaint handling apparatus (reads on commentary reporting service) related to the user-selected entity and the value of the monetary contributions and selections of the positive rating category and the negative rating category (Sloo; Figure 1, Figure 3, Figure 5, Item 512, column 3, lines 7-17, column 5, line 56 to column 6, line 4, column 6, lines 46-67, column 8, line 59 to column 9, line 10, column 11, line 63 to column 12, line 5, column 12, lines 15-25, column 12, line 61 to column 13, line 57, column 14, line 60 to column 15, line 40, column 18, lines 16-17).

(B) Claim 7 differs from claim 1 in that it is a method for recording and publicly reporting consumer monetary commentary by communicating with a commentary reporting service one time rather than a method for consumer recording and publicly reporting monetary commentary by communicating with a commentary reporting service two times.

As per independent claim 7, Sloo teaches a method for recording and publicly reporting consumer monetary commentary, the method comprising:

Art Unit: 3626

electronically communicating with a complaint handling apparatus (reads on commentary reporting service) at a first time (Sloo; see at least Figure 1, Figure 3, column 1, line 53 to column 2, line 20, column 2, lines 53 to column 3, line 30) to:

select an entity unrelated to the service provider (Sloo; see at least Figure 1, Figure 3, column 1, line 53 to column 2, line 20, column 2, lines 53 to column 3, line 30, column 6, lines 24-67);

select a positive rating category or a negative rating category for the selected entity (Sloo; column 3, lines 7-17, column 5, line 56 to column 6, line 4, column 6, lines 46-67, column 8, line 59 to column 9, line 10, column 11, line 63 to column 12, line 5, column 12, lines 15-24, column 14, line 60 to column 15, line 40, column 18, lines 16-17);

provide a voluntary monetary payment to the service provider for the selected rating category to thereby build the reputation of the selected entity up or down (Sloo; column 3, lines 7-17, column 5, line 56 to column 6, line 4, column 6, lines 46-67, column 8, line 19 to column 9, line 56, column 11, line 63 to column 12, line 5, column 12, lines 15-25, column 12, line 61 to column 13, line 57, column 14, line 60 to column 15, line 40, column 18, lines 16-17); and

storing data related to the selected entity, a value of the monetary payment and the decision to build the reputation of the selected entity up or down (Sloo; Figure 1, Figure 3, Figure 5, Item 514, column 3, lines 7-17, column 5, line 56 to column 6, line 4, column 6, lines 46-67, column 8, line 59 to column 9, line 10, column 11, line 63 to column 12, line 5, column 12, lines 15-25, column 12, line 61 to column 13, line 57, column 14, line 60 to column 15, line 40, column 18, lines 16-17).

Art Unit: 3626

(C) Claim 12 differs from claim 1 in that it is a method for recording and publicly reporting consumer monetary commentary from a plurality of consumers regarding an entity rather than a method for consumer recording and publicly reporting monetary commentary.

As per independent claim 12, Sloo teaches a method for recording consumer monetary commentary from a plurality of consumers regarding an entity, comprising:

electronically communicating with a plurality of consumers to identify an entity (Sloo; see at least Figure 1, Figure 3, column 1, line 53 to column 2, line 20, column 2, lines 53 to column 3, line 30, column 6, lines 24-67, column 19, lines 41-44);

accepting a monetary contribution from each of the plurality of consumers to alter the reputation of the identified entity wherein the monetary contribution is not a payment to the identified entity (Sloo; column 3, lines 7-17, column 5, line 56 to column 6, line 4, column 6, lines 46-67, column 8, line 19 to column 9, line 56, column 11, line 63 to column 12, line 5, column 12, lines 15-25, column 12, line 61 to column 13, line 57, column 14, line 60 to column 15, line 40, column 18, lines 16-17);

accepting data from each of the plurality of consumers indicating the respective selection of each of the consumers of a positive rating category or a negative rating category for the identified entity (Sloo; column 3, lines 7-17, column 5, line 56 to column 6, line 4, column 6, lines 46-67, column 8, line 19 to column 9, line 56, column 11, line 63 to column 12, line 5, column 12, lines 15-25, column 12, line 61 to column 13, line 57, column 14, line 60 to column 15, line 40, column 18, lines 16-17); and

Art Unit: 3626

storing data related to the identified entity, a value of the monetary contribution and consumer selections of the rating category (Sloo; Figure 1, Figure 3, Figure 5, Item 514, column 3, lines 7-17, column 5, line 56 to column 6, line 4, column 6, lines 46-67, column 8, line 59 to column 9, line 10, column 11, line 63 to column 12, line 5, column 12, lines 15-25, column 12, line 61 to column 13, line 57, column 14, line 60 to column 15, line 40, column 18, lines 16-17).

(D) As per claims 2-4, 8-10, 13-15 Sloo teaches a method as analyzed and disclosed in claims 1, 7, and 12 above

wherein communicating with the service provider or with the plurality of consumers comprises communicating with the commentary reporting service or service provider via a computer network (Sloo; see at least Figure 1, Figure 3, column 1, line 53 to column 2, line 20, column 2, lines 53 to column 3, line 30);

wherein communicating with the commentary reporting service or service provider or with the plurality of consumers comprises communicating with the commentary reporting service or service provider via a telephone network (Sloo; column 3, lines 30-38, column 4, line 60 to column 5, line 2, column 12, lines 15-24); and

wherein the monetary contribution to the commentary reporting service or service provider comprises providing the commentary reporting service or service provider with credit card information from the plurality of consumers (Sloo; column 12, lines 15-24).

(E) As per claim 11, 16 Sloo teaches a method as analyzed and disclosed in claim 7 above

Art Unit: 3626

further comprising:

electronically communicating with the service provider or a consumer at a second time different from the first time to:

select the entity (Sloo; see at least Figure 1, Figure 3, column 1, line 53 to column 2, line 20, column 2, lines 53 to column 3, line 30, column 6, lines 24-67);

retrieve the stored data from the service provider related to the monetary payment or contributions and selected rating category for the selected entity (Sloo; Figure 1, Figure 3, Figure 5, Item 512, column 3, lines 7-17, column 5, line 56 to column 6, line 4, column 6, lines 46-67, column 8, line 59 to column 9, line 10, column 11, line 63 to column 12, line 5, column 12, lines 15-25, column 12, line 61 to column 13, line 57, column 14, line 60 to column 15, line 40, column 18, lines 16-17); and

display, such as on a computer screen, the data related to the selected entity (Sloo; Figure 2, Item 210, column 4, lines 9-29).

(F) Claim 20 differs from claim 12 in that it is a system for consumer reporting on a computer network rather than a method for recording monetary commentary from a plurality of consumers regarding an entity.

System claims 20-24 recite the limitations of claims 12-16 respectively. As the underlying processes of claims 12-16 have been shown to be fully disclosed by the teachings of Sloo, it is readily apparent that the system disclosed by the applied prior art performs the recited underlying functions. As such, these limitations recited in claims 20-24 are rejected for the same reasons given above for method claims 12-16.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 5-6, 17-18, 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sloo, U.S. Patent Number 5, 895, 450 as applied to claim 1 above in view of COMPUTER CRIMES AND THE *RESPONDEAT SUPERIOR* DOCTRINE: *EMPLOYERS BEWARE!* Article, by M. Ishman, Spring 2000, URLs:

<http://www.ishmanlaw.com/resources/Respondeat_Superior.pdf>,

<<http://www.bu.edu/law/scitech/volume6/Ishman.htm>>, and

<<http://www.bu.edu/law/scitech/OLJ6.htm>>, hereinafter known as Ishman.

(A) As per claims 5, 17, 25 Sloo teaches a system and method for consumer recording and publicly reporting monetary commentary as analyzed and discussed in claims 1, 12, and 20 above.

Sloo fails to explicitly disclose wherein the stored data related to the reputation of the user-selected or identified entity comprises graphical data and the retrieving of data comprises retrieving graphical data indicating the value of the monetary contribution and selection of the positive rating category and the negative rating category.

However, the above features are well-known in the art, as evidenced by Ishman.

In particular, Ishman teaches wherein the stored data related to the reputation of the user-selected or identified entity comprises graphical data and the retrieving of data comprises retrieving graphical data indicating the value of the monetary contribution and selection of the positive rating category and the negative rating category (Ishman; page 3, footnote 15, page 37, footnote 309).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Sloo to include wherein the stored data related to the reputation of the user-selected or identified entity comprises graphical data and the retrieving of data comprises retrieving graphical data indicating the value of the monetary contribution and selection of the positive rating category and the negative rating category, as taught by Ishman, with the motivations of utilizing graphical information and illustrations to facilitate communications and provide service for users to exchange communications with each other (Ishman; page 3, footnote 15, page 37, footnote 309).

(B) As per claims 6, 18, 26 Sloo and Ishman teach a system and method as analyzed and discussed in claims 1, 5, 12, 17, 20, and 25 above

further comprising performing statistical analysis of the stored data related to the reputation of the user-selected entity to generate statistical data indicating the value of the monetary contribution to build the reputation up or down (Ishman; page 3, footnote 13, page 27, lines 1-4).

Art Unit: 3626

10. Claims 19 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sloo, U.S. Patent Number 5, 895, 450 and COMPUTER CRIMES AND THE *RESPONDEAT SUPERIOR* DOCTRINE: *EMPLOYERS BEWARE!* Article, by M. Ishman, Spring 2000, URLs: <http://www.ishmanlaw.com/resources/Respondeat_Superior.pdf>, <<http://www.bu.edu/law/scitech/volume6/Ishman.htm>>, and <<http://www.bu.edu/law/scitech/OLJ6.htm>>, hereinafter known as Ishman, as applied to claims 12, 18, 20 and 26 above, and further in view of Official Notice.

(A) As per claims 19 and 27, Sloo and Ishman teach a method and system as analyzed and disclosed in claims 12, 18, 20 and 26 above.

Although Sloo and Ishman teach statistical analysis of the stored data (Ishman; page 3, footnote 13, page 27, lines 1-4), Sloo and Ishman fail to explicitly disclose

wherein the statistical analysis of the stored data comprises calculating an average monetary contribution for the selected entity and the display of data comprises displaying the average monetary contribution to build the reputation up or down.

Examiner takes Official Notice that wherein the statistical analysis of the stored data comprises calculating an average monetary contribution for the selected entity and the display of data comprises displaying the average monetary contribution to build the reputation up or down is well known in the art of statistical data generation and statistical analysis of stored data.

As such, it is respectfully submitted that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the collective teachings of Sloo and Ishman to include wherein the statistical analysis of the stored data comprises calculating an

Art Unit: 3626

average monetary contribution for the selected entity and the display of data comprises displaying the average monetary contribution to build the reputation up or down, with the motivations of informing consumers about complaints while encouraging good conduct and cooperation between complainants and subjects and of punishing bad conduct (Sloo; column 1, lines 25-50).

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed 10 August 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments will be addressed hereinbelow in the order in which they appear in the responses filed 10 August 2004.

(A) Applicant's arguments on pages 8-10, 13-15 of the response filed 10 August 2004 with respect to claims 1-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

(B) At page 10 of the 10 August 2004 response, Applicant argues that the features in the Application are not taught or suggested by the applied references. In response, all of the limitations which Applicant disputes as missing in the applied references, including the newly added features in the 10 August 2004 amendment, have been fully addressed by the Examiner as either being fully disclosed or obvious in view of the collective teachings of Sloo and Ishman, based on the logic and sound scientific reasoning of one ordinarily skilled in the art at

Art Unit: 3626

the time of the invention, as detailed in the remarks and explanations given in the preceding sections of the present Office Action and in the prior Office Action (paper number 6), and incorporated herein. In particular, Examiner notes that the recited features of voluntarily provide a monetary contribution to the complaint handling apparatus (reads on commentary reporting service) are taught by the combination of applied references. Examiner interprets Sloo's "a portion of these collected fees can be used to pay or reward" and "pay a fee before posting a complaint" and "pay a fee before posting a response to a complaint" as reading on these limitations (Sloo; column 12, lines 15-25, column 12, line 61 to column 13, line 57, column 14, line 60 to column 15, line 40, column 18, lines 16-17).

(C) At pages 11-13 of the 10 August 2004 response, Applicant argues that the Sloo reference does not teach or suggest user selection of a positive or negative rating category for the user-selected entity. Examiner respectfully disagrees and notes that the Sloo reference's "ultimate reputation monitor" teaches " the complaint handling apparatus ... may maintain records on recorded objects updated over time as recorded encounters occur. By also recording and monitoring an aggregate of information such as complaint, sentiment, satisfaction, environment, and scientific data, and using artificial intelligence processes to link all data, the complaint handling apparatus would be able to identify object behavior as bad (e.g., complaint generating) or good (e.g., satisfaction generating) and may update object records according to their behavior displayed (and recorded) over time," which Examiner interprets as reading on selection of positive or negative rating category for user-selected entities (Sloo; column 18, lines 16-42). Furthermore, Examiner notes that it is the user, not "artificial intelligence," as argued by

Art Unit: 3626

Applicant on page 12, who provides the information, for example, complaint and satisfaction information (reads on negative and positive categories), which is aggregated by the monitoring and recording system.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. The cited but not applied reference Sheth, U. S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0032170, and the article teach Internet methods for reporting public opinions (Bell, B. Dealing with the "Cybersmear." April 1999 New York Law Journal. [Retrieved on September 20, 2004]. Retrieved from Internet. URL: < <http://www6.law.com/ny/tech/041999t3.html>>.

13. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington D.C. 20231**

or faxed to: **(703) 305-7687.**

For informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" on the front page of the communication and do NOT sign the communication.

After Final communications should be labeled "Box AF."
Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA, Seventh Floor (Receptionist).

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Natalie A. Pass whose telephone number is (703) 305-3980. The

Art Unit: 3626

examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9:00 AM to 6:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

15. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas, can be reached at (703) 305-9588. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

16. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Natalie A. Pass

September 20, 2004



ALEXANDER KALINOWSKI
PRIMARY EXAMINER